

**REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

Claims 1 to 99 are pending in this application and are subject to an election requirement under 35 U.S.C. § 121 as follows:

<b>Group</b>	<b>Claims that Group Reads on</b>	<b>Description Provided in Office Action</b>
<b>I</b>	1-27	A method of increasing the binding of an oligonucleotide comprising a compound of formula II, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
<b>II</b>	1, 28-32	A method of increasing the binding of an oligonucleotide comprising a compound of formula III, classified in class 435, subclass 6.
<b>III</b>	33-59	A compound of formula II, classified in class 536, subclass 23.1.
<b>IV</b>	60-72	A compound of formula III, classified in class 530, subclass 300, 333, 350.
<b>V</b>	73-83	A compound of formula IV, classified in class 536, subclass 1.11.
<b>VI</b>	84-99	A compound of formula V, classified in class 562, subclass 553.

Applicants hereby elect Group III, with traverse.

The Office Action asserts that the claims of Groups I-VI are “distinct.” Since the M.P.E.P. defines “distinct” inventions as ones which “ARE PATENTABLE (novel and unobvious) OVER EACH OTHER” (M.P.E.P. 802.01, emphasis in original), it is Applicants’ understanding that the PTO is of the view, for example, that each and every compound recited in the claims of one group is “novel and unobvious” in view of each and every compound recited in the claims of another group. (As will be recognized, such a position will preclude the PTO from asserting in any divisional application that a prior art reference disclosing one such compound renders the remaining compounds obvious.) If this is not the PTO’s position, then clarification should be provided. Applicants believe that the Group III claims presently before the Examiner patentably define the invention over the prior art and are otherwise in condition for ready allowance. Applicants also understand that, in

**DOCKET NO.:** ISIS-4853  
**Application No.:** 10/058,740  
**Office Action Dated:** March 18, 2004

**PATENT**

accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04, withdrawn process claims that include all the limitations of the patentable compositions can be rejoined as a matter of right prior to allowance or issuance of a final rejection. As the method claims of Group I (1-27) are of the same composition scope as the elected Group III claims, applicants request rejoinder and allowance of at least all of the claims belonging to Groups I and III (1-27 and 33-59). An early Office Action to that effect is, therefore, earnestly solicited.

Applicants wish to preserve the right to file divisional applications to the non-elected subject matter. If the Examiner is of a contrary view, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (215) 557-5984.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: April 19, 2004

---

Jeffrey H. Rosedale  
Registration No. 46,018

Woodcock Washburn LLP  
One Liberty Place - 46th Floor  
Philadelphia PA 19103  
Telephone: (215) 568-3100  
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439